

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 2-4 and 13 are pending. Claims 5-12 have been withdrawn. Claim 1 has been cancelled in lieu of new claim 13, which is based on original claim 1.

The Applicants have amended the Abstract to address the Examiner's concerns on page 2 of the Office Action.

Concerning the objection to the disclosure, the Applicants submit that the current spelling of "fiber" is preferred in every relevant American English dictionary, to the Examiner's suggested "fibre". Accordingly, the Applicants request reconsideration of the objection.

Similarly, the Applicants have not amended the claims to change the spelling of "fiber". However, the other matters noted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action have been addressed in the above amendments.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected to under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 3-4 have been amended to address the Examiner's comments.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Schubert et al (US Patent No. 6,460,113). The Applicants traverse as follows.

The present invention is directed in particular part to a terminal connected to the local area network, which terminal is equipped with operation and management software performing

storage management, including management of logical volumes in the various storages of the claimed client computers. The terminal also manages data arrangement, error monitoring, and setting up of fiber channel switches, as well as backup of data in the various storages.


In contrast, Schubert does not disclose a terminal corresponding to the claimed terminal. Further, Schubert does not disclose any means for managing data arrangement as claimed, but simply discloses that data is transferred between the client and the server using a fiber channel switch. In addition, Schubert does not disclose the management of setting up fiber channel switches as claimed, but only discloses a bridge 62 that is coupled to a fiber channel switch 48. Accordingly, claim 4 patentably defines over Schubert.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schubert et al in view of Pothapragada et al (US Patent No. 6,389,432).

Schubert has been distinguished above. Furthermore, Pothapragada fails to disclose the management of error monitoring for the various storages, but simply discloses a RAID disk array and fault tolerance associated therewith. In addition, Pothapragada does not disclose the terminal as claimed, which is also missing from Schubert. Therefore, the combination and Pothapragada does not render obvious the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Daniel J. Stanger  
Registration No. 32,846  
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 684-1120  
Facsimile: (703) 684-1157  
Date: August 11, 2003